

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/367,013	Applicant(s) KNUTZON ET AL.	
	Examiner Nashaat T. Nashed, Ph. D.	Art Unit 1656	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nashaat T. Nashed, Ph. D. (3) _____

(2) David W. Maher. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 18 October 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: Claims of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The lack of written description and enablement rejections of record under 35 U. S. C. 112, first paragraph, were discussed. It was pointed out to applicants that claims, which are not supported by the original disclosure will not be allowed, and that the scope of some of the claims do not meet the written description and enablement requirement. The rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph were discussed. With regard to the obviousness double patenting rejections of some of the claims, the examiner indicated that the rejection will be considered in light of the amended claim in the reissue application.